



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/787,183

02/27/2004

Kenji Sakaue

249418US2S

4589

22850 7590 05/05/2008
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

GUYTON, PHILIP A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2113

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/05/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/787,183	Applicant(s) SAKAUE ET AL.	
	Examiner PHILIP GUYTON	Art Unit 2113	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 19-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 10, 12, 13, 15, 19, 20 and 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 8, 9, 11, 14-16 and 21-24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, filed 19 February 2008, with respect to the rejection of claims 1-5, 7-10, 13, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new grounds of rejection is made in view of Lee.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification does not describe a clock signal being generated from the write-enable signal together with a read-enable signal indicating data is being read from memory. This would amount to simultaneous read and write abilities in the memory, which is not described or even suggested by the invention.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claim recites "a counter," which claim 2 already specifies. It is suggested that it was intended for claim 9 to depend on claim 1, instead of claim 2. Appropriate correction is required.

5. Claim 20 is objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "read data input from the memory the read data to the host" is grammatically incorrect. Appropriate correction is required.

6. Claim 25 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claim recites "a third clock signal," however there is no recitation of a second clock signal. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-5, 7, 10, 13, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,096,406 to Kanazawa et al. (hereinafter Kanazawa) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,399 to Hwang, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,813,184 to Lee.

With respect to claim 1, Kanazawa discloses an ECC (Error check and Correct) control apparatus (figure 1, item 4) to be connected between a host (figure 1, item 1) and a memory (figure 1, item 3), comprising:

a data-path circuit (figure 1, items 5, 7) which inputs and outputs data to and from the host (column 5, lines 58-64), and inputs and outputs data to and from the memory (column 5, lines 48-57);

a detecting circuit which detects a protected-data region and a redundant region of write data input from the host and having a predetermined data length (column 5, lines 48-53 and column 10, lines 44-64);

a code-generating circuit which generates an error-correction code for correcting errors in data of the protected-data region (figure 18, item 20A and column 14, lines 43-51); and

a code-inserting circuit which inserts the error-correction code in the redundant region (figure 18, item 30 and column 14, line 61-column 15, line 13 and column 5, lines 51-53);

wherein the data-path circuit outputs the write data to the memory in synchronization with a first clock signal and indicates that data is being written into the memory (column 3, lines 34-35 and column 10, lines 65-67 and column 12, lines 44-49).

Kanazawa does not disclose expressly an enable interface circuit which receives, from the host, a write-enable signal indicating that data is being written into the memory, and outputs the write-enable signal to the memory; and the enable interface circuit masks a write-enable signal which is unnecessary for the memory.

Hwang teaches a memory interface including an enable interface circuit with I/O lines which receives write-enable signals when data is to be written to the memory (column 1, lines 37-49). Additionally, the write-enable signal is not output when the write enable signal is unnecessary (write enable line at read enable level or low when not writing to memory).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Kanazawa by including an enable interface circuit as taught by Hwang. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because, as taught by Hwang, write-enable control lines ensure that the memory and the host processor are simultaneously available for data transfers (column 1, lines 30-35). Otherwise failure could possibly occur. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Hwang with Kanazawa in order to prevent possible failures in reading and writing from the memory.

Further, Kanazawa does not disclose expressly wherein the first clock signal is generated from the write-enable signal.

Lee teaches a NAND flash device wherein a clock generator is active to generate a clock signal in synchronization with a write enable signal (column 6, lines 13-23).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Kanazawa by generating a clock signal based on the write-enable signal, as taught by Lee. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because the clock signal is used to synchronize all actions occurring in the memory. By generating the clock signal from the write enable signal, it

is ensured that writing only occurs when the write enable signal is active, which is the objective of the write enable signal. If the clock and write enable signals were not synchronized, then writing could occur at times other than when the write enable signal is active, because writing would be based on the clock. Since Kanazawa desires for efficient synchronization of input/output and the clock (column 3, lines 34-41), it would have been obvious to incorporate the teachings of Lee to achieve a clock signal generated from the write enable signal.

With respect to claim 2, Kanazawa discloses a counter which counts data items of the write data (column 3, lines 34-41), and in which the detecting circuit detects the protected-data region and redundant region of the write data in accordance with a count value obtained by the counter (column 10, line 65-column 11, line 3 and column 12, lines 44-49).

With respect to claim 3, Kanazawa discloses wherein the detecting circuit detects a specified part of the redundant region (figure 4, item 9 and column 8, lines 4-8), the code-generating circuit generates an error-correction code for correcting errors in the data of the protected-data region and the data of those parts of the redundant region which precede the specified part, and the code-inserting circuit inserts the error-correction code in the specified part of the redundant region (column 8, lines 33-40 and column 12, lines 20-27).

With respect to claim 4, Kanazawa discloses a syndrome circuit which performs an syndrome operation on a read data input from the memory and having the predetermined data length, by using the error-correction code contained in the read

data, and which generates a syndrome signal, and an error-correcting circuit which corrects errors in accordance with the syndrome signal (column 13, lines 1-50).

With respect to claim 5, Kanazawa discloses wherein the error-correcting circuit comprises an error-presence/absence determining circuit which determines whether the read data contains errors, and an error-information generating circuit which generates correction information for correcting errors, when the error-presence/absence determining circuit determines that the read data contains errors (column 5, line 58-column 6, line 3 and column 8, lines 41-50).

With respect to claim 7, Kanazawa discloses wherein the error-information generating circuit generates normal-end information when the error-presence/absence determining circuit determines that the read data contains no errors (column 13, lines 19-22).

With respect to claim 10, Kanazawa discloses wherein the counter starts counting the pulses after the data-path circuit receives an address signal that represents the address of the write data (column 7, lines 8-17).

With respect to claim 13, Kanazawa discloses a region-changing circuit which changes that part of the redundant region which is provided to store the error-correction code, and in which the code-inserting circuit inserts the error-correction code in that part of the redundant region which has been changed by the region-changing circuit (column 12, lines 20-27).

With respect to claim 19, Kanazawa discloses wherein the memory is a NAND flash memory (figure 2 and column 6, lines 4-6).

With respect to claim 20, Kanazawa discloses wherein the data-path circuit outputs, to the host, read data input from the memory the read data to the host in synchronization with a second clock signal generated from a read-enable signal which is input from the host and indicates that data is being read from memory (column 3, lines 35-37 and column 12, lines 44-49 and column 15, lines 1-6).

9. Claims 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanazawa, Hwang, and Lee as applied above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,339,546 to Katayama et al. (hereinafter Katayama).

With respect to claim 6, Kanazawa does not disclose expressly wherein the error-presence/absence determining circuit determines whether the number of erroneous data items has exceeded a predetermined value, when the error-presence/absence determining circuit determines that the read data contains errors, and the error-information generating circuit generates abnormal-end information indicating that it is impossible to correct the read data, when the error-presence/absence determining circuit determines that the number of erroneous data items has exceeded the predetermined value.

Katayama teaches an ECC circuit that determines causes of errors in a flash memory device until a threshold number of errors are detected, whereupon it becomes impossible to continue using that storage element (column 2, lines 22-39).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Kanazawa by determining whether the number of

Art Unit: 2113

erroneous data items has exceeded a predetermined value as taught by Katayama. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because Katayama teaches in which flash memory often becomes susceptible to errors based on normal use over a long period of time (column 1, line 27-column 2, line 19). Thus, the technique of Katayama would have been highly desirable to Kanazawa in order to determine damaged memory locations, and thus avoid unnecessary errors.

With respect to claim 12, modified Kanazawa discloses in which the error-information generating circuit generates correction-end information when the error-presence/absence determining circuit determines that the number of erroneous data items has not exceeded the predetermined value (Katayama – column 4, line 62-column 5, line 12), and which further comprises an interruption circuit which generates and supplies an interruption signal to the host to interrupt the host and an information output circuit which outputs the normal-end information or the abnormal-end information to the host when the interruption circuit supplies the interruption signal to the host (column 13, lines 19-45).

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claims 8, 9, 11, 14, 15, 16, and 21-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PHILIP GUYTON whose telephone number is (571) 272-3807. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on (571) 272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PG
4/28/08

/Robert W. Beausoliel, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2113